

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF MINNESOTA

Dr. Jennifer Karen Mayer – 112,

Civ. No. 25-410 (PAM/ECW)

Plaintiff,

v.

**ORDER**

Derek Chauvin, Christopher Dunlap,  
and Ben Roethlisberger,

Defendants.

---

This matter is before the Court on Plaintiff Dr. Jennifer Karen Mayer’s Complaint (Docket No. 1) and Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (Docket No. 2 (IFP Application)). For the reasons below, the Court dismisses this action as frivolous and denies the IFP Application as moot.

The Complaint names three Defendants: (1) Derek Chauvin, presumably referring to the former Minneapolis police officer; (2) Christopher Dunlap, who goes unidentified; and (3) “Ben Roethlisberger,” apparently referring to Ben Roethlisberger, the retired professional American football quarterback. (Compl. at 2.) Mayer asserts that this Court’s jurisdiction is based on federal-question jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1331, specifically pointing to the United States Constitution’s Second Amendment. (Id. at 3.) But the Complaint contains no allegations against any Defendant, instead it alleges that Mayer filed police reports and received no follow-up. (Id. at 4.) For relief, Mayer seeks \$15 billion. (Id.)

Rather than pay this action's filing fee, Mayer submitted the IFP Application, which suggests she may qualify for in forma pauperis ("IFP") status. But under the federal statute governing IFP proceedings, a court may dismiss an IFP action at any time if it is frivolous. See 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

A complaint is frivolous if it "lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact." Neitzke v. Williams, 490 U.S. 319, 325 (1989). In this District, courts routinely dismiss complaints with no allegations about named defendants as factually frivolous. See, e.g., Valentino v. Hall, Civ. No. 24-3719, 2024 WL 5318980, at \*1 (D. Minn. Dec. 9, 2024) (Elkins, M.J.) (collecting cases), report and recommendation adopted, 2025 WL 71617, at \*1 (D. Minn. Jan. 10, 2025) (Schiltz, C.J.). Here, the Complaint is plainly frivolous: it fails to allege what any Defendant did or did not do that could make him liable to Mayer.

The Court therefore dismisses the Complaint without prejudice in its entirety. Given this determination, the Court also denies the IFP Application as moot.

Accordingly, **IT IS HEREBY ORDERED that:**

1. This matter is **DISMISSED without prejudice** as frivolous, under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B); and
2. Plaintiff's Application to Proceed in District Court Without Prepaying Fees or Costs (Docket No. 2) is **DENIED** as moot.

**LET JUDGMENT BE ENTERED ACCORDINGLY.**

Dated: February 5, 2025

s/ Paul A. Magnuson  
Paul A. Magnuson  
United States District Court Judge